



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/935,414 | 08/23/2001 | Elmootazbellah Nabil Elnozahy | AUS920010135US1 | 9849 |
| 45502 | 7590 | 02/23/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759 | | | HU, JINSONG | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 2154 |

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/935,414 | ELNOZAHY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jinsong Hu | 2154 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10 and 14-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10 and 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2, 5-10 and 14-23 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 19 have been amended; Claims 3-4, 11-13 and 20 have been canceled; Claims 21-23 are newly added claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-10 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deily et al. (US 2004/0044760).

4. As per claims 1 and 5, Deily teaches the invention as claimed including a web server having a user space and an operating system space [i.e., user-mode & kernel-mode, Fig. 4; par. 58], wherein the user space includes comprising of an application level interpreter [416, Fig. 4] configured to process client requests [pars. 12, 59-60 & 67-68; i.e., searching application pool to find the relevant group matches the request]; at least one kernel extension device driver enabling the application level interpreter to

communicate with a network interface [402, Fig. 4] to receive the client request [pars. 59-60 & 73].

5. Deily also teaches a transmission protocol library, including TCP/IP library routines, enabling the web server to process the client requests and the corresponding response within the user space [2020, Fig. 4]. Deily does not specify the TCP/IP library is in the user space. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including a TCP/IP library in user space because doing so would improve the integrity of the system by keeping the request processing module and the protocol library in the same place.

6. As per claim 2, Deily teaches the interpreter comprises an HTTP interpreter [par. 60].

7. As per claim 6, Deily teaches the web server includes a user space file cache [414, Fig. 4; par. 62].

8. As per claim 7, Deily teaches web server is configured to initiate multiple threads within its user space responsive to user requests [par. 96].

9. As per claims 9-10 and 14-15, since they are apparatus claims of claims 1-2 and 4-7, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-2 and 4-7 above.

10. As per claims 17-19, since they are computer program claims of claims 1-2 and 4-7, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-2 and 4-7 above.

11. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deily et al. (US 2004/0044760) in view of "Official Notice".

12. As per claim 8 and 16, Deily teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Deily does not specifically teach the user space threads including perl scripts, cgi threads and Java servlets. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for perl scripts, cgi threads and Java servlets are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art include perl scripts, cgi threads and Java servlets with Deily's system because it would improve the functionality of the system by providing diverse services to user.

13. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deily et al. (US 2004/0044760), in view of Lin et al. (US 6,272,522).

14. As per claims 21-23, Deily teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Deily does not specifically teach the step of polling network interface periodically. However, Lin on the other hand teaches the step of polling network interface periodically [102, Fig. 5; col. 8, lines 23-25]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Lin's polling step in Deily's system because it would

increase efficiency of the system by processing user's request without delay once user's request arrived. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Deily's system with Lin's polling step to improve the performance of the system.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/28/05 for claims 1-2, 5-10 and 14-23 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that (1) Deily does not teach a TCP/IP library and stack in the user space; (2) Deily does not teach the application level interpreter communicates with a dedicated network interface to receive the client requests.

16. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A. As to point (1), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the Deily's reference for handling TCP/IP request in the application level in the user space [pars. 12, 59-60 & 67-68; i.e., searching application pool to find the relevant group matches the request], even Deily does not specifically disclose a TCP/IP library in the user space it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including a TCP/IP library and stack in user space because doing so would improve the integrity of the system by keeping the request processing module and the protocol library in the same place.

B. As to point (2), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the Deily's reference for receiving [i.e., communicating] client's request from a TCP/IP service interface [i.e., network interface][par. 59] by application level interpreter [i.e., WAS process, par. 61-62]. Thus, Deily does teach the limitation.

Accordingly, Deily is still a relevant prior art reference.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

February 16, 2006


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100